UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/829,623	04/10/2001	Akira Koseki	JP920000050	7981

48813 7590 03/09/2006

LAW OFFICE OF IDO TUCHMAN (YOR)
69-60 108 STREET
SUITE 503
FOREST HILLS, NY 11375

EXAMINER	
PHAM, THOMAS K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2121	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/829,623	KOSEKI, AKIRA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas K. Pham	2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 December 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19,21 and 23-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19,21 and 23-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to amendment filed on 12/12/2005.

2. Claims 1-19, 21, 23-25 are pending.

Quotations of U.S. Code Title 35

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim Objections

7. Claims 1, 9 and 23 are objected to because of the following informalities: miss spell the word "hieratically". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. Claims 1, 9 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1

- the terms "information" and/or "network" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).
- claim 1 recites the limitation "amount of information content" in line 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Regarding claim 9

- the terms "information" and/or "network" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).
- claim 9 recites the limitation "amount of information content" in line 13. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Regarding claim 23

- the terms "information" and/or "network" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).
- claim 23 recites the limitation "amount of information content" in line 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- the phrase "A computer program product embodied in" in line 1 is conflicting with the phrase "computer readable program codes coupled to" in line 3, therefore, renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the program is "embodied in" or "coupled to" the tangible media. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).
- the term "tangible media" is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "tangible media" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

9. The language of the claim raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claimed invention is nothing more than an abstract idea that is not a practical application producing a useful and tangible result as explain below:

- as an example, the term "information" and/or "network" alone is an abstract idea since they do not associated with any specific instance. Anything could have or provide some form of "information" and/or "network". Since the claimed invention failed to define the type or form of "information" and/or "network", it is nothing more than an abstract idea.
- applicant's disclosure seems to have a utility required for a practical application, however, the claim does not reflect the disclosure. Thus, the claimed invention as a whole lacks patentable utility that required for a practical application producing useful result.
- the claimed invention do not provide a tangible or real-world result. A tangible requirement required that the claim must recite more than a Sec. 101 judicial exception, in that the process claim must set forth a practical application of that Sec. 101 judicial exception to produce a real-world result. Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72, 175 USPQ at 676-77 (invention ineligible because had "no substantial practical application."). "[A]n application of a law of nature or mathematical formula to a . . . process may well be deserving of patent protection." Diehr, 450 U.S. at 187, 209 USPQ at 8 (emphasis added); see also Corning, 56 U.S. (15 How.) at 268, 14 L.Ed. 683 ("It is for the discovery or invention of some practical method or means of producing a beneficial result or effect, that a patent is granted . . ."). In other words, the opposite meaning of "tangible" is "abstract."

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not producing a tangible result. Claim 2 is depended on claim 1, however, it does not add any feature or subject matter that represent any real-world result.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not producing a tangible result. Claim 3 is depended on claim 2, however, it does not add any feature or subject matter that represent any real-world result.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not producing a tangible result. Claim 4 is depended on claim 3, however, it does not add any feature or subject matter that represent any real-world result.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not producing a tangible result. Claim 5 is depended on claim 4, however, it does not add any feature or subject matter that represent any real-world result.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not producing a tangible result. Claim 6 is depended on claim 5, however, it does not add any feature or subject matter that represent any real-world result.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not producing a tangible result. Claim 7 is depended on claim 6, however, it does not add any feature or subject matter that represent any real-world result.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not producing a tangible result. Claim 8 is depended on claim 7, however, it does not add any feature or subject matter that represent any real-world result.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not producing a tangible result. Claim 17 is depended on claim 1, however, it does not add any feature or subject matter that represent any real-world result.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not producing a tangible result. Claim 19 is depended on claim 19, however, it does not add any feature or subject matter that represent any real-world result.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory for the reason that the claimed invention seemly described functionalities of a computer program which does not have a practical application producing useful and tangible result as explain below:

- an "apparatus" claim with process steps is not classified as a "hybrid" claim; instead, it is simply an apparatus claim including functional limitations. See, e.g., R.A.C.C. Indus. v. Stun-Tech, Inc., 178 F.3d 1309 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (unpublished). For example, by claiming "an information providing apparatus" does not make the claimed invention for an object, device or machine. The claimed invention merely includes functional limitations of a computer program that is not tangibly embodied in a manner so as to be executable. Computer programs claimed as computer listings per se, i.e., the descriptions or expressions of the programs, are not physical "things." They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized.

- applicant's disclosure seems to have a utility required for a practical application, however, the claim does not reflect the disclosure. Thus, the claimed invention as a whole lacks patentable utility that required for a practical application producing useful result.
- the claimed invention do not provide a tangible or real-world result. A tangible requirement required that the claim must recite more than a Sec. 101 judicial exception, in that the process claim must set forth a practical application of that Sec. 101 judicial exception to produce a real-world result. Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72, 175 USPQ at 676-77 (invention ineligible because had "no substantial practical application."). "[A]n application of a law of nature or mathematical formula to a . . . process may well be deserving of patent protection." Diehr, 450 U.S. at 187, 209 USPQ at 8 (emphasis added); see also Corning, 56 U.S. (15 How.) at 268, 14 L.Ed. 683 ("It is for the discovery or invention of some practical method or means of producing a beneficial result or effect, that a patent is granted . . ."). In other words, the opposite meaning of "tangible" is "abstract."

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not producing a tangible result. Claim 10 is depended on claim 9, however, it does not add any feature or subject matter that represent any real-world result.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not producing a tangible result. Claim 11 is depended on claim 10, however, it does not add any feature or subject matter that represent any real-world result.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not producing a tangible result. Claim 12 is depended on claim 11, however, it does not add any feature or subject matter that represent any real-world result.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not producing a tangible result. Claim 13 is depended on claim 12, however, it does not add any feature or subject matter that represent any real-world result.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not producing a tangible result. Claim 14 is depended on claim 11, however, it does not add any feature or subject matter that represent any real-world result.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not producing a tangible result. Claim 15 is depended on claim 14, however, it does not add any feature or subject matter that represent any real-world result.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not producing a tangible result. Claim 16 is depended on claim 15, however, it does not add any feature or subject matter that represent any real-world result.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not producing a tangible result. Claim 18 is depended on claim 9, however, it does not add any feature or subject matter that represent any real-world result.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not producing a tangible result. Claim 21 is depended on claim 9, however, it does not add any feature or subject matter that represent any real-world result.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory for the reason that the claimed invention seemly described functionalities of a computer program which does not have a practical application producing useful and tangible result as explain below:

- a "tangible media" does not limit the claimed invention to any type of media, thus, it can include media such as "carrier wave" or "carrier signal". A claimed signal has no physical structure, does not itself perform any useful, concrete and tangible result and, thus, does not fit within the definition of a machine, object or storage medium. A "tangible" requirement does not necessarily mean that a claim must either be tied to a particular machine or apparatus or must operate to change articles or materials to a different state or thing. However, the tangible requirement does require that the claim must recite more than a Sec. 101 judicial exception, in that the process claim must set forth a practical application of that Sec. 101 judicial exception to produce a real-world result. Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72, 175 USPQ at 676-77 (invention ineligible because had "no substantial practical application."). "[A]n application of a law of nature or mathematical formula to a . . . process may well be deserving of patent protection." Diehr, 450 U.S. at 187, 209 USPQ at 8 (emphasis added); see also Corning, 56 U.S. (15 How.) at 268, 14 L.Ed. 683 ("It is for the discovery or invention of some practical method or means of producing a beneficial result or effect, that a patent is granted . . ."). In other words, the opposite meaning of "tangible" is "abstract."
- the phrase "computer readable program codes coupled to the tangible media" in line 3 merely "connecting" the computer program codes to the "tangible media" rather than "storing" it in the "tangible media". Thus, the computer program product failed in

tangibly embodied in a storage medium in a manner so as to be executable. The claimed invention merely includes functional limitations of a computer program that is not tangibly embodied in a manner so as to be executable. Computer programs claimed as computer listings per se, i.e., the descriptions or expressions of the programs, are not physical "things." They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized.

- applicant's disclosure seems to have a utility required for a practical application, however, the claim does not reflect the disclosure. Thus, the claimed invention as a whole lacks patentable utility that required for a practical application producing useful result.
- the claimed invention do not provide a tangible or real-world result. A tangible requirement required that the claim must recite more than a Sec. 101 judicial exception, in that the process claim must set forth a practical application of that Sec. 101 judicial exception to produce a real-world result. Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72, 175 USPQ at 676-77 (invention ineligible because had "no substantial practical application."). "[A]n application of a law of nature or mathematical formula to a . . . process may well be deserving of patent protection." Diehr, 450 U.S. at 187, 209 USPQ at 8 (emphasis added); see also Corning, 56 U.S. (15 How.) at 268, 14 L.Ed. 683 ("It is for the discovery or invention of some practical method or means of producing a beneficial result or effect,

that a patent is granted . . ."). In other words, the opposite meaning of "tangible" is "abstract."

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not producing a tangible result. Claim 24 is depended on claim 23, however, it does not add any feature or subject matter that represent any real-world result.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not producing a tangible result. Claim 25 is depended on claim 23, however, it does not add any feature or subject matter that represent any real-world result.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. Claims 1-19, 21, 23-25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,275,988 ("Nagashima") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,557,007 ("Pekowski").

Regarding claim 1

Nagashima teaches an information providing method for a network, for providing, via a network (see col. 1 lines 15-19), content that constitutes an entire body of information based on conditions that are defined in advance (see col. 1 lines 20-25), comprising the steps of:

- generating a finite number of intermediate contents for content that corresponds to an entire body of information (see col. 13 line 65 to col. 14 line 13, *Examiner interprets that the image "Info 1 at resolution 3" as requested by user L must be generate or retrieve before it can be transmit to the user*);
- assigning each of the images a layer in the hierarchy based on the resolution of the image that is proportional with the charges for each of the images (see col. 2 lines 56-60); and

- selecting at least one of the intermediate contents and providing information at a selected level (see col. 3 lines 11-19).

Nagashima does not specifically teach intermediate contents are hierarchically structured according to the number of pages contained therein.

However, Pekowski teaches information contents are broken down into a number of pages which formatted in form of a tree-structured (see Col. 7 lines 9-16 and 57-64) for the purpose of displaying information of products or services to potential customers or clients (see Col. 1 lines 10-24).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the information processing of Pekowski with the system of Nagashima because it would provide for the purpose of displaying information of products or services to potential customers or clients.

Regarding claim 9

Nagashima teaches an information providing apparatus comprising:

- storage means for storing content that constitutes an entire body of information (see col. 17 lines 8-33);
- connection means for connecting said content to a network so as to provide said content (see col. 1 lines 20-25);
- generation means for, based on a condition determined in advance, generating intermediate contents at a finite number of levels relative to said content (see col. 13 line 65 to col. 14 line 13, *Examiner interprets that the image "Info 1 at resolution 3" as requested by user L must be generate or retrieve before it can be transmit to the user*);

- means for assigning each of the images a layer in the hierarchical based on the resolution of the image that is proportional with the charges for each of the images (see col. 2 lines 56-60); and
- output means for selecting and outputting at least one of said intermediate contents (see col. 3 lines 11-19).

Nagashima does not specifically teach intermediate contents are hierarchically structured according to the number of pages contained therein.

However, Pekowski teaches information contents are broken down into a number of pages which formatted in form of a tree-structured (see Col. 7 lines 9-16 and 57-64) for the purpose of displaying information of products or services to potential customers or clients (see Col. 1 lines 10-24).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the information processing of Pekowski with the system of Nagashima because it would provide for the purpose of displaying information of products or services to potential customers or clients.

Regarding claim 23

Nagashima teaches a computer program product embodied in a tangible media comprising:

computer readable program codes coupled to the tangible media for providing, via a network (see col. 1 lines 15-19), content that constitutes an entire body of information based on conditions that are defined in advance (see col. 1 lines 20-25), the computer readable program codes configured to cause the program to:

- generate a finite number of intermediate contents for content that corresponds to an entire body of information, selecting at least one of said intermediate contents (see col. 13 line 65 to col. 14 line 13, *Examiner interprets that the image "Info 1 at resolution 3" as requested by user L must be generate or retrieve before it can be transmit to the user*);
- assigning each of the images a layer in the hierarchical based on the resolution of the image that is proportional with the charges for each of the images (see col. 2 lines 56-60); and
- selecting at least one of the images for delivery at a selected layer (see col. 3 lines 11-19) for the purpose performing accounting processing (charges) in consideration of the kind and quality of information provided (see col. 1 lines 34-37).

Nagashima does not specifically teach intermediate contents are hierarchically structured according to the number of pages contained therein.

However, Pekowski teaches information contents are broken down into a number of pages which formatted in form of a tree-structured (see Col. 7 lines 9-16 and 57-64) for the purpose of displaying information of products or services to potential customers or clients (see Col. 1 lines 10-24).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the information processing of Pekowski with the system of Nagashima because it would provide for the purpose of displaying information of products or services to potential customers or clients.

Regarding claim 2

Nagashima further teaches wherein information contained in said content is employed as said intermediate content (see col. 1 lines 20-25, *Examiner interprets that the information being provided by an information service provider during communication between a consumer and a website provider.*).

Regarding claim 3

Nagashima further teaches wherein information obtained by changing at least a part of said information included in said content is employed as said intermediate content (see col. 17 lines 24-40).

Regarding claim 4

Nagashima further teaches a condition determined in accordance with a request from a user is defined as said condition that is defined in advance (see col. 6 lines 29-35, *Examiner interprets that the resolution of the images defined the condition in advance.*)

Regarding claim 5

Nagashima further teaches wherein an intermediate content is selected at a level that corresponds to said condition determined in accordance with said request from said user (see col. 3 lines 11-19).

Regarding claim 6

Nagashima teaches a condition for reducing or increasing the amount of information in said content is defined as said condition that is defined in advance (see col. 10 lines 49-60, *Examiner interprets that the image the information is reduce when the resolution of the image is low and the information increases when the resolution of the image is high*).

Regarding claim 7

Nagashima teaches wherein a condition for extracting an information type that represents said content is employed as said condition determined in advance (see col. 6 lines 22-27, *Examiner interprets that the resolution of the images defined the condition in advance.)*

Regarding claim 8

Nagashima teaches wherein price information is provided for said contents, and compensation information based on said price information is provided for each of said intermediate contents at said levels that are generated (see FIG. 3 and col. 7 lines 59-63).

Regarding claim 10

Nagashima teaches generation means employs information included in said content to generate intermediate contents at a finite number of levels (see col. 7 lines 22-38).

Regarding claim 11

Nagashima teaches wherein said generation means employs information obtained by changing at least a part of the information included in said content to generate intermediate contents at a finite number of levels (see col. 17 lines 24-40).

Regarding claim 12

Nagashima teaches wherein said generation means includes input means for receiving a request from said user (see col. 10 lines 49-53), and a condition designated in accordance with said request is employed as said condition determined in advance (see col. 6 lines 22-27, *Examiner interprets that the resolution of the images defined the condition in advance*).

Regarding claim 13

Nagashima teaches wherein said output means selects an intermediate content at a level that corresponds to said condition designated in accordance with said request from said user (see col. 10 lines 54-64).

Regarding claim 14

Nagashima teaches wherein said generation means generates said intermediate contents by defining, as said condition determined in advance, a reduction or an increase in the amount of information contained by said content (see col. 10 lines 49-60, *Examiner interprets that the image the information is reduce when the resolution of the image is low and the information increases when the resolution of the image is high*).

Regarding claim 15

Nagashima further teaches wherein said generation means generates said intermediate contents by defining, as said condition determined in advance, extraction of an information type that represents said content (see col. 2 lines 35-46).

Regarding claim 16

Nagashima further teaches price storage means for storing said content in correlation of with price information (see col. 1 lines 47-53); and compensation means for providing compensation information that is based on said price information for each of said intermediate contents at said levels that are generated (see col. 12 lines 55-62).

Regarding claim 17

Pekowski further teaches associating a content price for each of the intermediate contents based on the number of pages contained therein (see Col. 7 lines 9-16 and 57-64).

Regarding claim 18

Pekowski further teaches a price storage unit configured to associate a content price for each of the intermediate contents based on the number of pages contained therein (see Col. 7 lines 9-16 and 57-64).

Regarding claim 19

Nagashima teaches further comprising providing a grammatical description of the amount of information contained in said finite number of intermediate contents (see FIG. 3 and col. 7 lines 59-63).

Regarding claim 21

Nagashima teaches providing a description of the amount of information contained in said finite number of intermediate contents (see FIG. 3 and col. 7 lines 59-63).

Regarding claim 24

Nagashima teaches further comprising program codes configured to cause the program to provide a description of the amount of information contained in said finite number of intermediate contents (see FIG. 3 and col. 7 lines 59-63).

Regarding claim 24

Pekowski teaches further comprising program codes configured to cause the program to associate a content price for each of the intermediate contents based on the number of pages contained therein (see Col. 7 lines 9-16 and 57-64).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner *Thomas Pham*; whose telephone number is (571) 272-3689, Monday - Thursday from 6:30 AM - 5:00 PM EST or contact Supervisor *Mr. Anthony Knight* at (571) 272-3687.

Any response to this office action should be mailed to: **Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450.** Responses may also be faxed to the **official fax number (571) 273-8300.**

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thomas Pham
Patent Examiner

February 27, 2006